



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/638,757	08/14/2000	Peter Dean LaFauci	RAL9-2000-0070-US1	9942

25299 7590 06/18/2003

IBM CORPORATION  
PO BOX 12195  
DEPT 9CCA, BLDG 002  
RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709

EXAMINER

WILSON, YOLANDA L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2184

DATE MAILED: 06/18/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PR4

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/638,757	LAFAUCI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Yolanda Wilson	2184	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 August 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-12, 14 and 15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6, 13, 16, 17 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 August 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>2</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Objections***

1. Claims 6,13,16,17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-5, 7-12,14,15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chang (USPN 6178533B1). As appears in claim 1, Chang providing a set of transactions characterizing a bus architecture, selecting a subset of said set of transactions applicable to a design-under-test (DUT) and generating a configuration file for verifying said DUT from said subset in column 2, lines 12-17, "Each transaction is assigned a user-defined weight that is used to bias the frequency that a transaction type is tested. The test verification system selects a particular transaction category based on the user-defined weights and generates the corresponding instructions or test patterns that implement the transaction." and column 4, lines 16-19, "A user enters into the

Art Unit: 2184

weight file 138 the types of transactions that are to be tested as well as the frequency that each transaction is to be tested by setting the associated weight 142 accordingly.”

4. As per claim 2, Chang discloses generating a test case comprising bus transactions from said configuration file in column 4, lines 46-48, “The test generator engine 154 receives the weights input file 138 and generates two files of test patterns 156,158.”

5. As per claim 3, Chang discloses applying said test case to said DUT to verify said DUT in column 6, lines 20-23, “Next, the test pattern files 156,158, are transmitted to a target processor or simulation engine 159 which uses the test pattern files 156,158 to verify the functionality of the microprocessor (step 172).”

6. As per claim 4, Chang discloses providing a comprehensive set of bus transactions characterizing a bus architecture, creating a configuration file specific to a DUT from said comprehensive set, generating parameterized bus transactions from said configuration file in column 2, lines 12-17, “Each transaction is assigned a user-defined weight that is used to bias the frequency that a transaction type is tested. The test verification system selects a particular transaction category based on the user-defined weights and generates the corresponding instructions or test patterns that implement the transaction.” and column 4, lines 16-19, “A user enters into the weight file 138 the types of transactions that are to be tested as well as the frequency that each transaction is to be tested by setting the associated weight 142 accordingly.”

7. As per claim 5, Chang discloses providing a user interface which presents a user with possible transaction types for said bus architecture, entering inputs corresponding

Art Unit: 2184

to a specific DUT via said interface, processing said inputs to generate said configuration file in column 4, lines 16-19, "A user enters into the weight file 138 the types of transactions that are to be tested as well as the frequency that each transaction is to be tested by setting the associated weight 142 accordingly." and in column 4, lines 46-48, "The test generator engine 154 receives the weights input file 138 and generates two files of test patterns 156,158."

8. As per claim 7, Chang discloses inputs specify parameters for application to said specific DUT in column 4, lines 16-19, "A user enters into the weight file 138 the types of transactions that are to be tested as well as the frequency that each transaction is to be tested by setting the associated weight 142 accordingly."

9. As per claim 8, Chang discloses applying said parameterized transactions to said DUT to determine compliance of said DUT with said bus architecture in column 6, lines 20-23, "Next, the test pattern files 156,158, are transmitted to a target processor or simulation engine 159 which uses the test pattern files 156,158 to verify the functionality of the microprocessor (step 172)."

10. As per claim 9, Chang discloses providing a table having entries corresponding to a set of transactions of a bus architecture, applying inputs corresponding to a specific DUT to said table, modifying said entries using said inputs, generating a configuration file for verifying said DUT from said modified entries in column 2, lines 12-17, "Each transaction is assigned a user-defined weight that is used to bias the frequency that a transaction type is tested. The test verification system selects a particular transaction category based on the user-defined weights and generates the corresponding

instructions or test patterns that implement the transaction.” and column 4, lines 16-19, “A user enters into the weight file 138 the types of transactions that are to be tested as well as the frequency that each transaction is to be tested by setting the associated weight 142 accordingly.”

11. As per claim 10, Chang discloses applying is performed with a user interface in column 4, lines 16-19, “A user enters into the weight file 138 the types of transactions that are to be tested as well as the frequency that each transaction is to be tested by setting the associated weight 142 accordingly.”

12. As per claim 11, Chang discloses generating a DUT test case from said configuration file in column 4, lines 46-48, “The test generator engine 154 receives the weights input file 138 and generates two files of test patterns 156, 158.”

13. As per claim 12, Chang discloses applying selected parameters for verifying a DUT to a table including a set of transactions characterizing a bus architecture, modifying entries in said table in accordance with said parameters, generating a configuration file for verifying said DUT from said modified entries in column 2, lines 12-17, “Each transaction is assigned a user-defined weight that is used to bias the frequency that a transaction type is tested. The test verification system selects a particular transaction category based on the user-defined weights and generates the corresponding instructions or test patterns that implement the transaction.” and column 4, lines 16-19, “A user enters into the weight file 138 the types of transactions that are to be tested as well as the frequency that each transaction is to be tested by setting the associated weight 142 accordingly.”

14. As per claim 14, Chang discloses processing said configuration file to create a test case for said DUT in column 4, lines 46-48, "The test generator engine 154 receives the weights input file 138 and generates two files of test patterns 156,158."

15. As per claim 15, Chang discloses a memory including computer-executable instructions in Figure 1, label 106. Chang discloses a processor coupled to said memory for executing said instructions in Figure 1, label 102. Chang discloses a table including transactions characterizing a bus architecture, wherein said instructions support a user interface for entering inputs to generate a specific DUT configuration file from said table said configuration file including parameters and rules for verifying said DUT in column 2, lines 12-17, "Each transaction is assigned a user-defined weight that is used to bias the frequency that a transaction type is tested. The test verification system selects a particular transaction category based on the user-defined weights and generates the corresponding instructions or test patterns that implement the transaction." and column 4, lines 16-19, "A user enters into the weight file 138 the types of transactions that are to be tested as well as the frequency that each transaction is to be tested by setting the associated weight 142 accordingly."


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yolanda Wilson whose telephone number is (703) 305-3298. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:30-4:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Beausoliel can be reached on (703) 305-9713. The fax phone

Art Unit: 2184

numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

  
ROBERT BEAUSOLIEL  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100